

# The Gazette of India



PUBLISHED BY AUTHORITY

No. 21] NEW DELHI, SATURDAY JULY 5, 1958/ASADHA 14, 1880

## NOTICE

The undermentioned Gazettes of India Extraordinary were published upto the 27th June 1958 :—

Issue No.	No. and date	Issued by	Subject
113	S.O. 1201, dated the 11th June, 1958.	Election Commission, India.	Election Petition No. 331 of 1957.
114	S.O. 1202, dated the 21st June, 1958.	Ministry of Information and Broadcasting.	Certification of films to be of the description specified therein.
115	S.O. 1249, dated the 23rd June, 1958.	Election Commission, India.	Civil Miscellaneous First Appeal No. 5 of 1958.
116	S.O. 1250, dated the 24th June, 1958.	Ministry of Commerce and Industry.	Table of areas in which metric weights will be introduced on 1st October 1958.
	S.O. 1251, dated the 24th June, 1958.	Do.	Tables of classes of undertakings and classes of goods on which the provisions of the Standards of Weights and measures Act, 1956, shall come into force.
	S.O. 1252, dated the 24th June 1958.	Do.	Continuance of prevalent weights and measures for two years in respect of areas or classes of undertakings or goods referred to in S.O. 1250 and S.O. 1251, dated the 26th June 1958.
117	S.O. 1253, dated the 23rd June, 1958.	Election Commission, India.	Appointment of Assistant Electoral Registration Officers to assist the Electoral Registration Officer for 403 Tripura Parliamentary constituency.

Copies of the Gazettes Extraordinary mentioned above will be supplied on indent to the Manager of Publications, Civil Lines, Delhi. Indents should be submitted so as to reach the Manager within ten days of the date of issue of these Gazettes.

**PART II—Section 3—Sub-section (ii)**

**Statutory orders and notifications issued by the Ministries of the Government of India (other than the Ministry of Defence) and by Central Authorities (other than the Administrations of Union Territories).**

**MINISTRY OF HOME AFFAIRS**

*New Delhi, the 30th June 1958*

**S.O. 1263.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 22 of the Bengal Agricultural Income-tax Act, 1944 (Bengal Act IV of 1944), as extended to the Union territory of Tripura, the Central Government hereby appoints for the purpose of hearing appeals preferred under section 36 of the said Act, an Appellate Tribunal consisting of the following three members, namely:—

1. The District and Sessions Judge, Tripura, *Ex-Officio*—Judicial member and President of the Tribunal.
2. Shri R. C. Bhattacharjee, B.L., Advocate, Agartala—Lawyer member.
3. Shri Krishnadas Bhattacharjee, B.Com., A.C.A., Chartered Accountant, Agartala—Accountant member.

Each of the members mentioned above is appointed for the period of six months commencing on and from the date of this notification.

[No. F. 30/25/58-Jud.II.]

M. P. RODRIGUES, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF EXTERNAL AFFAIRS**

*New Delhi, the 26th June 1958*

**S.O. 1264.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by clause (a) of section 2 of the Diplomatic and Consular Officers (Oaths and Fees) Act, 1948 (41 of 1948), the Central Government hereby authorises Shri A. C. Mahajan, Registrar, Consulate General of India, Geneva, to perform the duties of a consular agent with effect from the 4th June, 1958 until further orders.

[No. 10-Cons./58.]

M. V. CHALAM, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF FINANCE**

**(Department of Economic Affairs)**

*New Delhi, the 23rd June 1958*

**S.O. 1265.**—In pursuance of clause (ii) of sub-section (5) of section 20 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), it has been determined that the following directors nominated under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 19 shall retire on the 30th June, 1958, namely:—

- (1) Shri Ramnath A. Podar, 10, Netaji Subhas Road, Bombay-1.
- (2) Shri V. S. Tyagaraja Mudaliar, 14, Sterling Road, Madras.

In pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 19, read with sub-section (3) of section 20 of the Act, the Central Government, in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, hereby re-nominates Sarvashri Ramnath A. Podar and V. S. Tyagaraja Mudaliar as directors on the Central Board of the State Bank of India with effect from the 1st July, 1958.

[No. F.8(56)-58/SB.]

*New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1266.**—In continuation of this Ministry's notification No. F. 2(7)-FI/58 dated the 22nd May, 1958, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Kamal

Kumar Ghosh, officiating Court Liquidator, Calcutta High Court, to continue to officiate as Court Liquidator attached to the said High Court for a further period up to the afternoon of the 31st August, 1958, vice Shri Monoj Kumar Gangulii granted leave.

[No. 2(7)-F.I/58.]

*New Delhi, the 1st July 1958*

**S.O. 1267.**—It is hereby published for general information that in pursuance of clauses (i) and (ii) of sub-section (5) of section 20 of the State Bank of India Act, 1955 (23 of 1955), it has been determined that the following persons shall retire on the 30th June, 1958, as directors on the Central Board of Directors of the State Bank of India:—

- |  |  |
|--|--|
| 1. Shri J. D. Choksi, "Empress Court" Churchgate<br>Mukhammat, Bombay. | } Directors elected under<br>clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 19.      |
| 2. Shri D. P. Goenka,<br>14, Mukhtar Babu Street, Calcutta.            |  |
| 3. Shri Ramnath A. Podar,<br>10, Netaji Subhas Road, Bombay 1.         | } Directors nominated<br>under clause (d) of<br>sub-section (1) of section 19. |
| 4. Shri V. S. Tyagaraja Mudaliar,<br>14, Sterling Road, Madras.        |  |

In pursuance of clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 19, Shri J. D. Choksi has been re-elected as director on the Central Board of Directors of the State Bank of India, with effect from the 1st July, 1958.

In pursuance of the proviso to clause (c) of sub-section (1) of section 19, the Reserve Bank of India has re-nominated Shri D. P. Goenka as director on the Central Board of Directors of the State Bank of India with effect from the 1st July, 1958.

In pursuance of clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 19, read with sub-section (3) of section 20, the Central Government, in consultation with the Reserve Bank of India, has renominated Sarvashri Ramnath A. Polar and V. S. Tyagaraja Mudaliar as directors on the Central Board of Directors of the State Bank of India with effect from the 1st July, 1958.

[No. F. 8/56/58-SB.]

R. K. SESHADRI, Dy. Secy.

**(Department of Economic Affairs)**

*New Delhi, the 24th June 1958*

**S.O. 1268.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by Rule 4 of the Life Insurance Corporation Rules, 1956 the Central Government hereby accepts the resignation of Shri B. K. Kaul, I.C.S., from the membership of the Life Insurance Corporation of India with effect from the 27th May, 1958.

In exercise of the powers conferred by Section 4 of the Life Insurance Corporation Act, 1956 (31 of 1956) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. Gangulee to be a member of the Life Insurance Corporation of India with effect from the 27th May, 1958.

[No. 6(2)-INS(II)/57.]

M. V. RANGACHARI, Special Secy.

## (Department of Economic Affairs)

New Delhi, the 26th June 1958

S.O. 1269.—Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, as on the 20th day of June, 1958.

## BANKING DEPARTMENT

Liabilities	Rs.	Assets	Rs.
Capital paid up . . . . .	5,00,00,000	Notes . . . . .	38,51,17,000
Reserve Fund . . . . .	80,00,00,000	Rupee Coin . . . . .	9,04,000
National Agricultural Credit (Long-term Operations) Fund . . . . .	20,00,00,000	Subsidiary Coin . . . . .	2,14,000
National Agricultural Credit (Stabilisation) Fund . . . . .	2,00,00,000	Bills Purchased and Discounted :—	
		(a) Internal . . . . .	..
Deposits :—		(b) External . . . . .	..
(a) Government		(c) Government Treasury Bills . . . . .	70,26,000
(1) Central Government . . . . .	49,90,26,000	Balances held abroad* . . . . .	17,41,67,000
(2) Other Governments . . . . .	15,24,75,000	**Loans and Advances to Governments . . . . .	46,62,61,000
(b) Banks . . . . .	93,68,03,000	Other Loans and Advances† . . . . .	55,13,19,000
(c) Others . . . . .	112,05,80,000	Investments . . . . .	267,15,55,000
Bills Payable . . . . .	17,53,78,000	Other Assets . . . . .	14,22,38,000
Other Liabilities . . . . .	44,45,39,000		
TOTAL . . . . .	439,88,01,000	TOTAL . . . . .	439,88,01,000

\*Includes Cash &amp; Short Term Securities.

\*\* Includes Temporary Overdrafts to State Governments.

†The item 'Other Loans and Advances' includes Rs. 11,75,97,000/- advanced to scheduled banks against usance bills under Section 17 (4) (c) of the Reserve Bank of India Act.

Dated the 25th day of June 1958.

An Account pursuant to the Reserve Bank of India Act, 1934, for the week ended the 20th day of June 1958.

ISSUE DEPARTMENT

Liabilities	Rs.	Rs.	Assets	Rs.	Rs.
Notes held in the Banking Department . . . . .	38,51,17,000		A. Gold Coin and Bullion :—		
Notes in circulation . . . . .	<u>1586,91,03,000</u>		(a) Held in India . . . . .	117,76,03,000	
Total Notes issued . . . . .		1625,42,20,000	(b) Held outside India . . . . .	..	
			Foreign Securities . . . . .	<u>209,67,56,000</u>	
			TOTAL OF A . . . . .		327,43,59,000
			B. Rupee Coin . . . . .		130,42,58,000
			Government of India Rupee Securities . . . . .		1167,56,03,000
			Internal Bills of Exchange and other commercial paper . . . . .		..
TOTAL—LIABILITIES . . . . .		1625,42,20,000	TOTAL—ASSETS . . . . .		1625,42,20,000

Dated the 25th day of June 1958.

H. V. R. IENGAR, Governor.

[No. F. 3 (2)-F.1/58.]

A. BAKSI, Jt. Secy.

ERRATUM

The date of the Statement of the Affairs of the Reserve Bank of India, Banking Department published on page 934 of the Gazette of India, Part II-Sec. 3(ii), dated the 14th June 1958, should be "30th May 1958" instead of "31st May 1958".

## (Department of Revenue)

## INCOME-TAX

*New Delhi, the 16th June 1958*

S.O. 1270.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 (11 of 1922) the Central Government is pleased to appoint Shri R. Kothandaraman to be a Commissioner of Income-tax.

This notification shall be deemed to have taken effect from the 11th June 1958 (forenoon).

[No. 61(F. No. 55/23/58-IT).]

B. V. MUNDKUR, Under Secy.

## (Department of Revenue)

## CUSTOMS

*New Delhi, the 28th June 1958*

S.O. 1271.—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 23 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878 (8 of 1878), as applied to the State of Pondicherry, the Central Government hereby exempts goods specified in Column (2) of the Table hereto annexed when exported from the State of Pondicherry through the Port of Pondicherry, from payment of the duty of customs leviable thereon under the Second Schedule to the Indian Tariff Act, 1934 (32 of 1934) to the extent specified in the corresponding entry in column (3) of the said Table.

TABLE

S. No.	Description of goods	Extent of Exemption
(1)	(2)	(3)
1. Soft Cotton waste	. . . . .	. 2½% <i>ad valorem</i>
2. Hard Cotton waste	. . . . .	. 2½% <i>ad valorem</i>

[No. 198.]

M. C. DAS, Dy. Secy.

## CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE, DELHI

## CENTRAL EXCISES

*New Delhi, the 26th June 1958*

S.O. 1272.—Under Rule 233 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944 I hereby, direct that the owner of Excisable goods deposited in a licenced private warehouse who seeks extension of time for retention of his goods in bond beyond the period of three years from the date of first warehousing prescribed in Rule 145 of Central Excise Rules, 1944 or further extension of time for such retention beyond the extended period already granted should submit his application for such extension or further extension at least three months in advance of the expiry of the prescribed period or the extended period, as the case may be, failing which his application will be liable to be rejected.

[No. V(a)(23)20CE/58/31017.]

*New Delhi, the 27th June 1958*

S.O. 1273.—In exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Rules 15 and 16 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I hereby make the following changes in the

Notification issued under C. No. V(a) (24)35/Int/57/23709, dated the 14th May, 1958:—

In the said Notification,

(i) following sentence shall be omitted:

"The provisions of this Notification, however, do not apply to areas already exempted from excise control under the Hilly, Jungle and Desert Areas Scheme."

(ii) In the schedule, the following shall be substituted, wherever it occurs, against the circles shown below:—

Circle	Substitute in		For the existing entries under :—	
	Col. 8	Col. 9	Col. 8	Col. 9
	cents	lbs.	cents	lbs.
Delhi . . . . .	5	50	4	40
Patiala . . . . .	5	60	4	40
Jullundur . . . . .	5	60	4	40
Ludhiana . . . . .	5	60	3	40

[C. No. V(a) (24)35/Int/57/32074.]

**S.O. 1274.**—In exercise of the powers conferred upon me under Rules 15 and 16 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, I do hereby notify that no declaration will be necessary under the said Rules, in the whole of Swaimadhopur and Bharatpur Districts excepting in the Deeg, Kaman and Nagar Tehsils and the revenue villages set out in the subjoined table, in respect of Unmanufactured tobacco grown in areas not exceeding 5 cents and cured in quantities not exceeding 60 lbs.

TABLE

Name of State	Name of the Revenue District	Name of Tehsil	Name of revenue villages
1	2	3	4
Rajasthan	Bharatpur	Nadbai . . . . .	1. Nadbai.
		Weir . . . . .	1. Bhusawar.
		Rupbas . . . . .	1. Khera Thakur.
		"	2. Rudawal.
		Dholpur . . . . .	1. Dobera
		"	2. Phuspur.
	"	Bari . . . . .	1. Bari
		"	2. Rahel
		Baseri . . . . .	1. Tajpur
	Swaimadhopur	"	2. Bagthar
		Khandor . . . . .	1. Bagora
		Gangapur . . . . .	1. Khandeep
		Nadoti . . . . .	1. Gidani
		"	
		Karoli . . . . .	1. Agree
		"	2. Randhkpura
		"	3. Pahari
		"	4. Rajor
	"	Toda Bhim . . . . .	1. Nand Khurd
		"	2. Gorda
		"	3. Ghazipur
		"	4. Mohanpur.

[C. No. V(a) (24)35/Int/57/Pt. II/31176.]

B. D. DESHMUKH, Collector.

## OFFICE OF THE ASSISTANT COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE, BOMBAY

Bombay the 23rd June 1958

S.O. 1275.—Whereas it appears that the marginally noted unclaimed goods which were seized by the Central Excise Staff on 5th March 1958 at about 5-30 hrs. in the jurisdiction of Ch. No. 13 and 14 were

S. No.	Description of the goods & country of origin	Qty.	Value
			Rs.
1.	'Odhani' rose colour, of Chirmin Cloth with gold jari	1	100
2.	'Odhani' darkblue, Chirmin cloth with gold jari	1	25
3.	Odhani green colour	1	25
4.	Ladies Payjama, Satin, Chocolate Colour with border of gold jari	1	50
5.	Ladies Payjama, Blue colour, Satin	1	100
6.	Ladies Payjama Dark blue, Satin cloth	1	25
7.	Ladies Payjama, Green Colour, Satin cloth	1	40
8.	'Odhani' dark blue colour, Chirmin cloth, with gold jari	1	30
9.	'Odhani' light green used with jari	1	25
10.	Frock, with gold jari	1	50
11.	'Frock' satin cloth, Rose colour, with gold jari	1	25
12.	'Frock' Blue colour Chirmin Cloth, gold jari	1	15
13.	'Frock' dark blue colour	1	50
14.	'Frock' green colour satin cloth with golden jari	1	15
15.	'Frock' with black colour cloth	1	25
16.	Cotton border for Payjamas	2	3
	TOTAL		603

from Daman Portuguese Territory in India, in contravention of Sec. 5(1) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 and the Govt. of India, Ministry of Commerce & Industry I.T.C Order No. 17/55 dated 7-12-55 issued under the Import & Export Control Act, 1947 and deemed to have been issued under Sec. 19 of the Sea Customs Act, 1878. Now therefore any person claiming the goods is hereby called upon to show cause to the Assistant Collector of Central Excise, Bombay III Dn., as to why the above mentioned goods should not be confiscated under Sec. 5(3) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 read with Section 167 (8) of the Sea Customs Act 1878

and why a penalty should not be imposed on him under Section 7(1) (c) of the Land Customs Act, 1924 read with Sec. 167(8) of the Sea Customs Act, 1878. If such an owner fails to turn up to claim the above mentioned goods or to show cause against the action proposed to be taken within 30 days from the publication of this notice in the Govt. of India Gazette/Bombay State Government Gazette, the goods in question will be treated as unclaimed and the case will be decided accordingly.

[No. VIII/10-1/58.]

R. V. SARDESAI, Asstt. Collector.

## COLLECTOR OF CENTRAL EXCISE, CALCUTTA

## CENTRAL EXCISE

Calcutta, the 21st June 1958

S.O. 1276.—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by Rule 233 of the Central Excise Rules, 1944, read with Rule 173 *ibid*, I hereby order that licensees authorised to receive mineral oils in bond shall maintain a tankwise record of receipts and issues in the form annexed.

2. This form shall be brought into use on and from the 1st July, 1958.



ANNEXURE

Tank No. \_\_\_\_\_ & Date \_\_\_\_\_  
 Bond No. \_\_\_\_\_  
 Commodity :—

R E C E I P T S

Sl. No.	Date	Opening Balance at 86° F		Name of the vessel and Refinery from which received	AR. 3 No. & date, and rate of duty as advised by C.E. officer at source	No. & date of advice from the despatching end	Date & time of arrival of the consignment
		Imp. Gall.	Tons				
1	2	3(a)	3(b)	4	5	6	7

R E C E I P T S

Quantity Bonded							
At natural temperature				Corrected to 86°F.			
Date & time of completion of discharge	Observed temperature	Specific Gravity	Quantity		Specific gravity	Quantity	
			Imp. gallon.	Tons		Imp. gallon	Tons
8	9(a)	9(b)	9(c)	9(d)	10(a)	10(b)	10(c)

## R E C E I P T S

Presumptive assessment of duty		DELIVERIES				
Rate	Amount	Total quantity on late at 86° F (Total of Col. 3—10)		No. & Date of application for removal		
		Imp. Gallons	Tons.	A. R. I.	A.R. 3	A.R. 4
11	12	13	14	15(a)	15(b)	15(c)

## D E L I V E R I E S

Quantity delivered						
Natural temperature				Corrected to 86°F.		
Observed temperature	Specific gravity	Quantity		Specific gravity	Quantity	
		Imp. Gall.	Tons		Imp. Gall.	Tons
16(a)	16(b)	16(c)	16(d)	17(a)	17(b)	17(c)

Duty paid		Loss or gain ascertained		Balance (at 86°F)		Remarks
Rate	Amount	Imp. Gall.	Tons	Imp. Gall.	Tons.	
18(a)	18(b)	19(a)	19(b)	20(a)	20(b)	21

- NOTE :— (i) The principle of 'First-in First-out' shall be adopted, and issues on different dates shall be shown against a particular receipt until it is exhausted; separate 'cages' being set apart for each A.R.3.
- (ii) Besides recording the quantity and specific gravity at the natural temperature at the time of bonding/deliveries all quantities shall be corrected to the standard temperature of 86°F with reference to relevant specific gravity.
- (iii) All direct clearances on payment of duty i.e., clearances *ex-vessel* without bonding in a licensed tank ashore shall also be similarly accounted for at 86°F in a separate record in the same form with suitable modifications.

[No. 11/1958.]

S. C. MATHUR, Collector.

**THE MYSORE CENTRAL EXCISE COLLECTORATE, BANGALORE****CENTRAL EXCISES**

*Bangalore, the 19th June 1958*

**S.O. 1277.**—Notification No. 6/58 dated the 5th April, 1958 published under S.O. No. 672 on pages 456—458 of Part II, Sec. 3(ii) of the Gazette of India, dated the 26th April, 1958 is hereby cancelled.

[No. 12/58.]

D. N. KOHLI, Collector.

**CENTRAL BOARD OF REVENUE**

*New Delhi, the 16th June 1958*

**S.O. 1278.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 (11 of 1922) and in partial modification of all previous notifications on the subject the Central Board of Revenue hereby directs that with effect from 11th June 1958 (forenoon) Shri R. Kothandaraman who has been appointed by the Central Government to be a Commissioner of Income-tax, shall perform all the functions of Commissioner of Income-tax in respect of such areas or of such persons or classes of persons or such incomes or classes of incomes or such cases or classes of cases as are comprised in the Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts in the States of Bihar and Orissa:

Provided that he shall also perform his functions in respect of such persons or of such cases as have been or may be assigned by the Central Board of Revenue to any Income-tax Authority subordinate to him:

Provided further that he shall not perform his functions in respect of such persons or such cases as have been or may be assigned to any Income-tax Authority outside his jurisdictional area.

While performing the said functions the said Shri Jain shall be designated as the Commissioner of Income-tax Bihar and Orissa with headquarters at Patna.

**Explanatory Note**

**NOTE.**—The amendments have become necessary due to the change in the incumbent of the Commissioner's charge.

(This does not form a part of the amendments but is intended to be clarificatory).

[No. 62(F.No.55/23/58-IT).]

**INCOME-TAX**

**S.O. 1279.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 5 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 (11 of 1922) and in partial modification of all previous notifications on the subject, the Central Board of Revenue hereby directs that Shri Jamuna Prasad Singh, a Commissioner of Income-tax, shall perform all the functions of Commissioner of Income-tax in respect of such areas or of such persons or classes of persons or of such incomes or classes of incomes or of such cases or classes of cases as are comprised in the Income-tax Circles, Wards or Districts in the State of Madras excluding the whole of Coimbatore District:

Provided that he shall also perform his functions in respect of such persons or of such cases as have been or may be assigned by the Central Board of Revenue to any Income-tax Authority subordinate to him:

Provided further that he shall not perform his functions in respect of such persons or of such cases as have been or may be assigned to any Income-tax Authority outside his jurisdictional area.

While performing the said functions the said Shri Singh shall be designated as the Commissioner of Income-tax, Madras with headquarters at Madras.

2. This notification shall take effect on and from the 9th June 1958 (afternoon).

*Explanatory Note*

NOTE.—The amendments have become necessary due to change in the incumbent of Commissioner's post.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory).

[No. 63 (F. No. 55/23/58-IT).]

*New Delhi, the 27th June 1958*

S.O. 1280.—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of section 5 of the Indian Income-tax Act, 1922 (11 of 1922) and in partial modification of all previous notifications on the subject, the Central Board of Revenue hereby directs that Shri S. P. Jain, a Commissioner of Income-tax, shall perform all the functions of Commissioner of Income-tax in respect of such areas or of such persons or classes of persons or such incomes or classes of incomes or such cases or classes of cases as are comprised in the following income-tax Circles, Wards and Districts, namely:—

1. Rajkot Circle.
2. Special Survey Circle II, Rajkot.
3. Bhavnagar Circle.
4. Jamnagar Circle.
5. Surendranagar Circle.
6. Junagadh Circle.
7. Amreli Circle.
8. Morvi Circle.
9. Porbandar Circle.
10. Bhuj Circle.
11. Nasik Circle.
12. Jalgaon Circle.
13. Dhulia Circle.
14. Surat Circle.
15. Navsari Circle.
16. Broach Circle.
17. Nadiad Circle.
18. Godhra Circle.
19. Baroda Circle.
20. Special Circle, Baroda.
21. Petlad Circle.
22. Mehsana Circle.
23. Patan Circle.
24. Circle I, Ahmedabad.
25. Circle II, Ahmedabad.
26. Circle III, Ahmedabad.
27. Special Circle, Ahmedabad.
28. Additional Special Circle, Ahmedabad.
29. Special Circle I, Ahmedabad.
30. Special Circle II, Ahmedabad.
31. Special Survey Circle I, Ahmedabad.
32. Special Survey Circle III, Ahmedabad.
33. Special Investigation Branch, Ahmedabad.
34. Kadi Circle.
35. Palanpur Circle.
36. E.D.-cum-I.T. Circle, Ahmedabad.
37. E.D.-cum-I.T. Circle, Baroda.
38. E.D.-cum-I.T. Circle, Surat.
39. E.D.-cum-I.T. Circle, Rajkot.

Provided that he shall also perform his functions in respect of such persons or of such cases as have been or may be assigned by the Central Board of Revenue to any Income-tax Authority subordinate to him:

Provided further that he shall not perform his functions in respect of such persons or such cases as have been or may be assigned to any income-tax authority outside his jurisdictional area.

While performing the said functions the said Shri Jain shall be designated as the Commissioner of Income-tax, Bombay North with headquarters at Ahmedabad.

This notification shall be deemed to have taken effect from the 21st June, 1958 (forenoon).

*Explanatory Note*

NOTE.—The amendments have become necessary on account of a change in the incumbent of the post of the Commissioner of Income-tax.

(The above note does not form a part of the notification but is intended to be merely clarificatory.)

[No. 64 (F. No. 55/23/58-IT).]

B. V. MUNDKUR, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY**

*New Delhi, the 24th June 1958*

**S.O. 1281.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 14 of the Standards of Weights and Measures Act, 1956 (89 of 1956), the Central Government hereby permits, in respect of the class of undertaking or goods referred to in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.O. 1033, dated the 30th May, 1958 the continuance of the use, for a period of two years from the 1st day of July, 1958 of any weight or measure which, immediately before that day, was in use in respect of the said class of undertaking or goods.

[No. 287-S.M.C./57.]

K. V. VENKATACHALAM, Jt. Secy.

**COFFEE CONTROL**

*New Delhi, the 24th June 1958*

**S.O. 1282.**—The Central Government hereby notifies that on his election by the Rajya Sabha under section 4(2)(xiv) of the Coffee Act, 1942, Shri B. P. Basappa Shetty has been appointed to be a member of the Coffee Board for a period of three years with effect from the date of the publication of this Notification.

[No. 1(2)Plant(B)/57.]

A. J. MUKARJI, Dy. Secy.

**ORDERS**

*New Delhi, the 23rd June 1958*

**S.O. 1283/IDRA/5/Am.(7).**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 5 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (85 of 1951), read with rule 8 of the Central Advisory Council (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Mr. J. I. Jamieson to be a member of the Central Advisory Council of Industries in place of Shri D. P. Goenka, who has resigned, and makes the following amendment in the Order of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Heavy Industries No. S.R.O. 2534, dated the 1st November, 1956, namely:—

In the said Order, under the heading "To represent the interests of owners of industrial undertakings in scheduled industries" for entry No. 14 relating to Shri D. P. Goenka, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

"14. Mr. J. I. Jamieson, Chairman, Indian Jute Mills Association, Royal Exchange, Calcutta."

[No. 1(5)IA(II)(G)/58.]

**S.O. 1284/IDRA/6/1/Am.(2).**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (85 of 1951), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri G. Balaram to be a member of the Development Council established by the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.O. 966/IDRA/6/1, dated the 22nd May

1958, for the scheduled industry engaged in the manufacture and production of Bicycles, and directs that the following amendments shall be made in the said Order, namely:—

(i) For item 9 and the entries relating thereto, the following shall be substituted, namely:—

- |   |   |  |
|---|---|--|
| <p>“9. Shri Nir-njan Dihidei, Secretary, Sen-Raleigh Employees Union, Dhadka Road, Asansol (West Bengal).”</p> <p>“9A. Shri G. Balaram, Assistant Secretary, T.I. Cycle Factory Employees Union, 136, Strahan's Road, Madras—12.”</p> | } | <p>“being persons who in the opinion of the Central Government are capable of representing the interests of persons employed in industrial undertakings in the said scheduled industry”.</p> |
|---|---|--|

(ii) Paragraph 1(b) shall be omitted.

[No. 4(2)IA(II)(G)/58.]

**S.O. 1285/IDRA/6/3/Am.(5).**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 6 of the Industries (Development and Regulation) Act, 1951 (85 of 1951), read with rule 8 of the Development Councils (Procedural) Rules, 1952, the Central Government hereby appoints Mr. H. V. Echols to be a member of the Development Council for the scheduled industry engaged in the manufacture and production of Non-ferrous metals including alloys (and semi-manufacturers thereof) vice Mr. E. S. Greenwood, who has resigned, and makes the following amendment in the Order of the Government of India in the late Ministry of Heavy Industries No. S.R.O. 79, dated the 5th January 1957, namely:—

In paragraph 1 of the said Order under the category of members “being persons who in the opinion of the Central Government are capable of representing the interests of owners of industrial undertakings in the said scheduled industry”, for entry No. 7 relating to Mr. E. S. Greenwood, the following entry shall be substituted, namely:—

- “7. Mr. H. V. Echols, Messrs. Indian Aluminium Co. Ltd., 31, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16”.

[No. 4(42)IA(II)(G)/58.]

S. M. BANERJEE, Under Secy.

## ORDERS

### EXPORT TRADE CONTROL

*New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1286.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 3 and 4A of the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947 (18 of 1947), as in force in India and as applied to the State of Pondicherry, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the exports (Control) Order, 1958, namely:—

Under the heading “B. RAW MATERIALS AND ARTICLES MAINLY UN-MANUFACTURED”, entry (xviii) of item 2(a)—Nickel ores and concentrates—shall be omitted.

[No. Export (1)/AM(10).]

**S.O. 1287.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sections 3 and 4A of the Imports and Exports (Control) Act, 1947 (18 of 1947), as in force in India and as applied to the State of Pondicherry, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the Exports (Control) Order, 1958, namely:—

In Schedule I to the said Order—

Under the heading “A. ANIMALS, FOOD AND DRINK” entry (xix) of item I-A—Gharial—shall be omitted.

[No. Export (1)/AM(11).]

T. S. KUNCHITHAPATHAM, Under Secy.

## CORRIGENDUM

New Delhi, the 24th June 1958

**S.O. 1288.**—In the Notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Commerce and Industry No. S.O. 1033 dated the 30th May 1958, published at page 866 of Part II Section 3 Sub-section (ii) of the Gazette of India dated the 7th June, 1958, for "Forward Markets (Regulation) Act 1952" read "Forward Contracts (Regulation) Act 1952".

[No. 287-S.M.C./57.]

P. N. NAYAR,

Secretary, Standing Metric Committee.

## (Indian Standards Institution)

New Delhi, the 19th June 1958

**S.O. 1289.**—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 4 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Rules, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the Standard Mark, design of which together with the verbal description of the design and the title of the relevant Indian Standard is given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been specified.

This Standard Mark, for the purpose of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Act, 1952 and the rules and regulations framed thereunder, shall come into force with effect from 30th June 1958.

## THE SCHEDULE

Design of the Standard Mark	No. and title of relevant Indian Standard	Verbal description of the design of the Standard Mark
(1)	(2)	(3)

IS : 227-1954 Specification for  
Malleable Iron Castings



The monogram of the Indian Standards Institution, consisting of letters ISI, drawn in the exact style and relative proportions as indicated in column (1), the number designation of the Indian Standard being inscribed in the top side and the relevant IS grade designation being inscribed in the bottom side of the monogram as indicated in the design for '1' in column (1).

[No. MDC/11(5).]

**S.O. 1290.**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (3) of regulation 7 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standards Institution hereby notifies that the marking fee per unit for malleable iron castings for cycle bottom shells and motor truck chassis parts, details of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, has been determined and the fee shall come into force with effect from 30th June 1958.

## THE SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Product/Class of Products	No. and title of relevant Indian Standard	Unit	Marking Fee per Unit
1	Malleable Iron Castings for (i) Cycle Bottom Shells, and (ii) Motor Truck Chassis Parts	IS : 227-1954 Specification for Malleable Iron Castings	One piece	(i) <i>Cycle Bottom Shells</i> :— One Naya Paisa with a minimum of Rs. 150·00 for production during a calendar year, and (ii) <i>Motor Truck Chassis Parts</i> :— Three Naye Paise with a minimum of Rs. 150·00 for production during a calendar year.

[No. MDC/11(6).]



*New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1291.**—In pursuance of sub-regulation (1) of regulation 8 of the Indian Standards Institution (Certification Marks) Regulations, 1955, the Indian Standard Institution hereby notifies that two licences, particulars of which are given in the Schedule hereto annexed, have been granted authorizing the licensees to use the Standard Mark.

THE SCHEDULE

Licence No. and Date	Period of Validity		Name and Address of the Licensee	Article covered by the licence	Relevant Indian Standard
	From	To			
1 CM/L-90 20-5-1958	1-7-1958	30-6-1959	The National Screw and Wire Products Ltd., 51 Stephen House, 4 Dalhousie Square, Calcutta-1.	Hard-drawn copper solid and stranded circular conductors for overhead power transmission purposes.	IS : 282-1951 Specification for Hard-Drawn Copper Solid and Stranded Circular Conductors for Overhead Power Transmission Purposes.
2 CM/L-91 20-5-1958	1-7-1958	30-6-1959	Arbariya Malleable Industries, 3276 Gudri Mansoor Khan, Agra.	Malleable iron castings for cycle bottom shells and motor truck chassis parts.	IS : 227-1954 Specification for Malleable Iron Castings.

[No. MDC/12(199).]

D. V. KARMAKAR,  
Deputy Director (Marks),

**MINISTRY OF STEEL, MINES & FUEL****(Department of Mines and Fuel)***New Delhi, the 23rd June 1958*

**S.O. 1292.**—In pursuance of sub-rule (i) of rule 48 of Order XXI of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (5 of 1908), the Central Government hereby appoints the Director, Indian Bureau of Mines, New Delhi as the officer to whom notices of orders attaching the salaries and allowances of persons employed in the Indian Bureau of Mines may be sent.

[No. 173(54)/58-MIII.]

K. N. RAJAGOPLAN, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF FOOD AND AGRICULTURE****(Department of Agriculture)****CORRIGENDA***New Delhi, the 30th June 1958*

**S.O. 1293.**—In S.O. 1123, dated 12th June, 1958,

1. For numbers "2" and "3" occurring in Column 1 against the entries "Butter" and "Cereals" read "3" and "4".

2. For the unit shown against item 17, Tobacco, unmanufactured in column 3 viz. cwt. read lb.

[No. 4-1/58-C(E).]

S. R. SEN, Economic & Statistical Adviser and  
Dy. Secy.

**MINISTRY OF TRANSPORT AND COMMUNICATIONS****(Department of Transport)****(Transport Wing)****LIGHTHOUSES & LIGHTSHIPS***New Delhi, the 1st July 1958*

**S.O. 1294.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 6 of the Indian Lighthouse Act, 1927 (17 of 1927) the Central Government hereby authorises the Director of Lighthouses and Lightships, Madras District, to enter upon and inspect any local lighthouse in the States of Mysore, Kerala, Madras or Andhra Pradesh and make such inquiries in respect thereof or of the management thereof as he thinks fit.

2. This order shall remain in force for a period of one year from the date of its publication.

[No. 20-ML(2)/58.]

S. K. GHOSH, Dy. Secy.

**(Dep'ts. of Communications and Civil Aviation)***New Delhi, the 5th July 1958*

**S.O. 1295.**—In pursuance of rule 160 of the Indian Aircraft Rules, 1937, the Central Government hereby exempts for a further period up to 31st December 1958, all persons incharge of aircraft engaged in international navigation, from the operation of clause (v) of sub-rule (2) of rule 7 of the said Rules, in so far as it requires such persons to carry in the said aircraft, the aircraft and engine log books, subject to the condition that the working copies of the aforesaid documents are carried in the said aircraft.

[No. AR/1937(43)/F.No. 10-A/53-58.]

D. R. KOHLI, Under Secy.

**MINISTRY OF SCIENTIFIC RESEARCH AND CULTURAL AFFAIRS***New Delhi, the 23rd June 1958*

**S.O. 1296.**—In pursuance of sub-rule (1) of rule 48 of Order XXI of the First Schedule to the Code of Civil Procedure, 1908 (5 of 1908), the Central Government hereby appoints the officers of the Ministry of Scientific Research and Cultural Affairs specified in column of the table below, as officers to whom notices of orders attaching the salaries and allowances of the officers specified in the corresponding entries in column 2 of the said table shall be sent.

TABLE

Officers to whom notices should be sent.	Officers whose salaries and allowances are attached.
The Assistant Educational Adviser (Technical) in charge of the Regional Office at Calcutta.	Non-gazetted officers of the Regional Office at Calcutta.
The Assistant Educational Adviser (Technical) in charge of the Regional office at Bombay.	Non-gazetted officers of the Regional Office at Bombay.
The Assistant Educational Adviser (Technical) in charge of the Regional Office at Madras.	Non-gazetted officers of the Regional Office at Madras.
The Assistant Educational Adviser (Technical) in charge of the Regional Office at Kanpur.	Non-gazetted officers of the Regional Office at Kanpur.

[No. F.1-8/58T-1.]

H. S. SHAHANI,

Assistant Educational Adviser (T).

*New Delhi, the 27th June 1958*

**S.O. 1297.**—In pursuance of sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Indian Institute of Technology (Kharagpur) Act, 1956 the following changes in the membership of the Board of Governors of the Indian Institute of Technology, Kharagpur are hereby notified:—

- (i) Flight Lt. His Highness Sri Pratap Chandar Bhanja Deo, G.C.I.E., K.C.I.E., Maharaja of Mayurbhanj, Baripada (Orissa) in place of Shri G. D. Birla.
- (ii) Shri A. V. Venkteswaran, Financial Adviser to the Government of India, Ministry of Finance, New Delhi in place of Shri D. S. Nakra, Financial Adviser to the Government of India, New Delhi.
- (iii) Shri Amar Nath Agarwal, Member, Rajya Sabha in place of Shri Chandulal P. Parikh, Member, Rajya Sabha.

[No. F. 20-66/57-T6.]

G. N. VASWANI,

Assistant Educational Adviser (T).

**MINISTRY OF IRRIGATION AND POWER****ORDER***New Delhi, the 27th June 1958*

**S.O. 1298.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-rule (2) of Rule 133 of the Indian Electricity Rules, 1956, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of proviso (a) of Rule 118, clause (a), sub-rule (1) of rule 119, and sub-rule (7) of rule 123 of the said Rules shall be relaxed in the case of the use of (1) one new Marion III M, 4½ cubic yard, 3.3 K.V., electrically driven excavating shovel comprising 200 H.P., 3300 volts, 3 phase, G.E. main driving motor, serial No. 6334 Z, one 5000 volts, G.E. oil circuit-breaker, Cat. No. 2883228, one 3300/110, 2 K.V.A., G.E. transformer, serial No. XNCY, one 5 KVA, 3300/120/240 volts, G.E. transformer, serial No. 9T24Y98, one 3 KVA., 3300/120/240 volts, G.E. transformer, serial No. 9T24Y97, one 3 KVA., 3300/120/240 volts, G.E.

transformer. serial No. 9T24Y97 and switch fuse unit one set and (2) a length of 600 ft., of 3.3 K.V., 163/018 sq. inch, 4 core, V.I.R., P.O.P. galvanised steel strand wire armoured tough rubber sheathed flexible trailing cable, for removal of overburden in the Bermo mines of Messrs. Damodar Valley Corporation to the extent that the aforesaid transformers and other associated equipment may not be fixed machines while it is moving from one place to another and subject to the following conditions:—

- (1) the machine shall be worked with due care so as to avert danger arising out of any electrical defects and the insulation resistance of the high pressure circuit, including the machine driving motor, shall not be less than 10 megohms;
- (2) the flexible trailing cable for use with the excavating machine shall be connected to the electricity supply system and the machine by properly constructed connector boxes;

Provided that the aforesaid relaxation shall be valid only for such time as the said machine is in use at the Bermo mines of the Damodar Valley Corporation and that due information shall be given to the Central Government through the Electric Inspector of Mines, as soon as this machine is taken out of the said colliery.

[No. EL-III-353(17)/58.]

N. S. VASANT, Officer on Special Duty.

### MINISTRY OF REHABILITATION

*New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1299.**—Whereas the Central Government is of opinion that it is necessary to acquire the evacuee properties specified in the schedule hereto annexed in the State of Bombay for a public purpose, being a purpose connected with the relief and rehabilitation of displaced persons, including payment of compensation to such persons;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 12 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), it is notified that the Central Government has decided to acquire, and hereby acquires, the evacuee properties specified in the said Schedule.

#### SCHEDULE

Sl. No.	Description of property.	Name of Evacuee Owner.
1.	Ginning and pressing Factory near Railway Station, Sendurni, Tehsil-Jamner, Distt. East Khandesh.	1. Mohd. Sulman. 2. Kasam Mitha. 3. Rahiyabai W/o Dr. Khatil. 4. Sherifabai W/o Mitha. 5. Yusuf Mohamad Mitha.
2.	Ginning Factory and Oil Mill at Patur, Taluka, Jamner on Jalgaon Ajantha Road, Distt. East Khandesh.	-do-

[No. F. 1(1216)/58/Comp.III/Prop.]

(Office of the Chief Settlement Commissioner)

#### ORDER

*New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1300.**—In exercise of the powers conferred on me by sub-section (2) of Section 34 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954) and in supersession of this office ORDER NO. F.4(1)Comp-II/57/Pol-I. dated the 26th May, 1958, I hereby delegate my powers to extend the period for the deposit of the balance of the purchase money or for furnishing particulars of compensation applications of associates in the case of property purchased by auction or tender as required under proviso to sub-rule 11 and 12 of rule 90 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation & Rehabilitation) Rules, 1955 to Shri P. N. Khanna, Regional Settlement Commissioner, Indore.

[No. F.4(1)Comp-II/57/Pol-I.]

I. N. CHIB,  
Chief Settlement Commissioner.

**OFFICE OF THE CHIEF SETTLEMENT COMMISSIONER***New Delhi, the 30th June 1958*

**S.O. 1301.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 3 of the Displaced Persons (Compensation and Rehabilitation) Act, 1954 (44 of 1954), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri S. P. Passay as Assistant Settlement Commissioner for the purpose of performing the functions assigned to such officers by or under the said Act with effect from the date he took charge of his office.

[No. 5(7)/Admn(Reg)/CSC/58.]

M. L. PURI, Settlement Commissioner &  
*Ex-Officio Under Secy.*

**MINISTRY OF LABOUR AND EMPLOYMENT***New Delhi, the 24th June 1958*

**S.O. 1302.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (3) of section 1 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948, (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following amendments in the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.R.O. 2035, dated the 5th September, 1956, namely:—

In the said notification,—

1. item IV shall be re-numbered as item IV-(1) and in the said item so re-numbered, for brackets, letter and words:

“(i) Ayyanthol,

in the Trichur taluk and revenue village of Amballoor

in Mukundapuram taluk in Trichur District”

the following shall be substituted, namely:—

“(i) Ayyanthol,

(j) Villavattom,

(k) Edakuanni,

(l) Avinisery,

in the Trichur taluk in Trichur District.”;

2. after item IV-(1) as so re-numbered, the following shall be added, namely:—

“(2) The revenue villages of:

(a) Thoravu,

(b) Nenmarrikara,

(c) Thrikkur,

(d) Amballoor.

in the Mukundapuram taluk in Trichur District.”

The amendments made by this notification shall be deemed to have effect as and from the 16th September 1956.

[No. HI-13(3)/58.]

*New Delhi, the 27th June 1958*

**S.O. 1303.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 87<sup>L</sup> of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948) and in continuation of the notification of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment No. S.R.O. 3977, dated the 9th December, 1957, the Central Government hereby exempts the Thorium/Uranium Plant, Trombay, from the operation of the said Act for a further period of six months with effect from the 8th June, 1958.

[No. HI-6(250)/57.]

*New Delhi, the 1st July 1958*

**S.O. 1304.**—In pursuance of section 10 of the Employees' State Insurance Act, 1948 (34 of 1948), the Central Government hereby reconstitutes the Medical Benefit

Council which shall with effect from the date of publication of this notification in the Official Gazette, consist of the following members, namely:—

- (1) The Director General, Health Services, *Ex-Officio—Chairman.*

*Members*

- (2) Lt. Col. V. Srinivasan, Deputy Director General of Health Services (Medical).
- (3) The Medical Commissioner of the Employees' State Insurance Corporation, *Ex-Officio.*
- [Nominated by the State Governments concerned under clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10.]
- (4) General D. N. Chakaravarti, Director of Health Services, West Bengal, Calcutta.
- (5) Dr. U. C. Bordoi, Director of Health Services, Assam, Shillong.
- (6) Dr. V. R. Thayumanaswami, M.S., F.R.C.S., M.Ch. (Ortho), Director of Medical Services, Madras.
- (7) Dr. Govindlal Sharma, M.B., B.S. (Hons.), M.D. (Medicines), M.D. (Pathology), Director of Health Services, Madhya Pradesh, Indore.
- (8) Dr. P. A. P. Singh, Deputy Director of Health Services (Administration), Bihar.
- (9) Dr. D. P. Sethna, F.R.C.S., Surgeon General to the Government of Bombay.
- (10) Dr. K. M. Lal, Director of Medical and Health Services, Uttar Pradesh, Lucknow.
- (11) Dr. S. N. Gantayet, M.B., B.S., D.O. (Oxon), Director of Health Services, Orissa, Bhubanaswer.
- (12) Dr. Jagdish Singh, Director of Health Services, Punjab, Chandigarh.
- (13) Major K. N. Rao, M.D.O., D.G.O., F.C.C.P., F.I.C.S., Director of Medical Services, Andhra Pradesh.
- (14) Dr. Venkatarasubba Rao, Director of Medical Services, Government of Mysore.
- (15) Dr. M. K. Pillai, Administrative Medical Officer, Employees' State Insurance Scheme, Kerala.
- (16) Dr. B. N. Sharma, M.B., B.S. F.A.C.S., F.V.A.S., Director of Medical and Health Services, Rajasthan.
- [Nominated by the Central Government under clause (e) of sub-section (1) of section 10 in consultation with organisations of employers recognised by that Government.]
- (17) Shri Madanmohah Mangaldas, 'Mangal Bagh', Ellis Bridge, Ahmedabad.
- (18) Shri R. K. Parikh, General Manager, Shree Ram Mills Limited, Ferguson Road, Lower Parel, Bombay-13.
- [Nominated by the Central Government under clause (f) of sub-section (1) of section 10 in consultation with organisations of employees recognised by that Government.]
- (19) Shri Hrishii Banerjee, c/o West Bengal Committee of the All-India Trade Union Congress, 249, Bowbazar Street, Calcutta-12.
- (20) Shri Ramsinghbhai Varma, M.P., President, I.N.T.U.C., Madhya Pradesh Branch, Shram Shivir, Snehalataganj, Indore.
- (21) Dr. S. L. Kashikar, President, I.N.T.U.C., Nagpur Branch, Gujerwada, Kothi Road, Mahal, Nagpur.
- [Nominated by the Central Government under clause (g) of sub-section (1) of section 10 in consultation with organisation of medical practitioners recognised by that Government.]
- (22) Dr. N. N. Bhattacharjee, 95, Akhil Mistri Lane, Calcutta-9.
- (23) Dr. H. N. Shivapuri, 43-C, Cantonment Road, Lucknow, Uttar Pradesh.
- (24) Dr. (Mrs.) Maitreyee Bose, M.B., M.D. (Munich), 47, Chowringhee Road, Calcutta-16.

[F. No. HI-1(1)/58.]

P. R. NAYAR, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1305.**—Whereas immediately before the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), became applicable with effect from the 1st November, 1952, to the factory known as the Western India Paper & Board Mills (Private) Limited, Vikhroli, (C.R.) Post Bhandup, Bombay-40, there was in existence a provident fund common to the employees employed in the factory to which the said Act applies and the employees in their Sales Office situated at Crescent Chambers, Tamarind Lane, Fort, Bombay-1;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of that Act shall also apply to the Sales Office of the said factory situated at Bombay.

[No. PF. II-9(18)/58.]

**S.O. 1306.**—Whereas immediately before the Employees' Provident Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952), became applicable with effect from the 31st July, 1956, to the factory known as the Kolhapur Sugar Mills Limited, Kasaba, Bavada, Kolhapur, there was in existence a provident fund common to the employees employed in the factory to which the said Act applies and the employees in their Distillery;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 3 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that the provisions of that Act shall also apply to the establishment of Distillery of the said factory situate at Kolhapur.

[No. PF. II-9(5)/58.]

**S.O. 1307.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the Bombay Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme 1956, the same having been previously published as required by the said sub-section, namely:—

*Amendment*

In the said Scheme, in item (c) of sub-clause (1) of clause 15, for the words "Port Authority", the following words shall be substituted, namely:—

"Bombay Port Trust".

[No. Fac.175(19)57.]

**S.O. 1308.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of employment) Act, 1948, the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the Calcutta Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme 1956, the same having been previously published as required by the said sub-section, namely:—

*Amendment*

In the said Scheme, in item (c) of sub-clause (1) of clause 15 and sub-clause (2) of clause 42, for the words "Port Authority", the following words shall be substituted, namely:—

"Calcutta Port Commissioners".

[No. Fac.175(19)/57.]

**S.O. 1309.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of section 4 of the Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Act, 1948 (9 of 1948), the Central Government hereby makes the following further amendment in the Madras Dock Workers (Regulation of Employment) Scheme, 1956, the same having been previously published as required by the said sub-section, namely:—

*Amendment*

In the said Scheme, in item (c) of sub-clause (1) of clause 15 and sub-clause (2) of clause 42, for the words "Port Authority", the following words shall be substituted, namely:—

"Madras Port Trust".

[No. Fac. 175(19)/57.]

*New Delhi, the 30th June 1958*

**S.O. 1310.**—In pursuance of the provisions of paragraph 20 of the Employees' Provident Fund Scheme, framed under section 5 of the Employees' Provident

Funds Act, 1952 (19 of 1952) the Central Government hereby appoints Shri Shah Aziz Ahmad, I.A.S., as Regional Provident Fund Commissioner for the whole of the State of Uttar Pradesh vice Shri J. N. Tewari, I.A.S.

Shri Aziz Ahmad shall work under the general control and superintendence of the Central Provident Fund Commissioner.

[No. PF-I/31(465)/58.]

P. D. GAIHA, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1311.**—In pursuance of section 17 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby publishes the following award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, in the industrial dispute between the employers in relation to Ranipur Colliery, P.O. Dishergarh and their workmen.

**BEFORE THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT INDUSTRIAL TRIBUNAL, DHANBAD.**

REFERENCE No. 9 OF 1957

Employers in relation to the Ranipur colliery P.O. Dishergarh

and

Their workmen represented by the Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

Appearances:

For the employers:

Shri D. Narsingh, Advocate, instructed by Shri O. P. Bhatnagar, Labour Relations Officer of the Ranipur Colliery and later Shri S. K. Mukherjee, Advocate.

For the workmen:

Shri D. Sen Gupta, Advocate, instructed by Shri S. Das Gupta, Secretary Shri L. P. Tripathi, Organising Secretary, and Shri S. Prasad Singh, for the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

PRESENT

Shri Salm M. Merchant, B.A. LL.B.,

Chairman

Dhanbad, dated the 11th June 1958

Industry: Coal

State: Bihar.

#### AWARD

The Government of India, Ministry of Labour & Employment, by order No. LR.II-55-2(20)/57 dated 13th August, 1957 made in exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (2) of Section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (Act XIV of 47) was pleased, on a joint application made by the employers in relation to the Ranipur colliery and the Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, which, Government was satisfied represented the majority of the workmen, to refer the industrial dispute between them in respect of the matter specified in the schedule to the said order to me for adjudication. The matter specified in the order of reference is:—

"Is the appointment of Shri Ramdahn Singh as supervisor at Ranipur proper and is the Union's objection to his appointment and demand for his removal justified?"

2. After the usual notices were issued on the parties, the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh representing the workmen filed its written statement on 4th October 1957 and the Employers filed their written statement on reply on 28th October, 1957. Thereafter, the dispute was heard at Dhanbad on 11th March 1958 and 12th March 1958, when parties examined their witnesses, filed documents and made their submissions, after which the hearing was concluded.

3. However, on 14th March 1958, Shri D. Narsingh, the learned Advocate for the company appeared before me and filed a written application in which it was stated that as at the hearing of the dispute on 11th March 1958 certain documents



on behalf of the workmen were filed for the first time and as the management was not in a position to verify their records relating to the allegations made in those documents and did not have sufficient time to produce the relevant papers from their records; that if sufficient time had been granted they would have been able to produce their records; that after the arguments were over on 12th March 1958, the management had been able to find certain papers dealing with some of the documents filed on behalf of the workmen, and that those papers would refute the allegations contained in the documents filed by the workmen. The application concluded with the following prayer:—

"That your petitioners beg to file herewith the documents which were collected from the records of your petitioners as aforesaid and your petitioners further pray that those documents may be treated as part of the record in the case, and that day may be fixed for *hearing on this record* before passing the Award"

(under lining mine). Along with this application a list of the 11 documents which the company desired to file as also copies of the 11 documents were filed.

4. As when the application was presented Shri D. Sengupta Advocate, who had represented at the other side was present in court, I heard his submissions in opposition. I, however, felt that in the interest of the proper adjudication of the dispute on merits an opportunity should be given to the management to produce this record.

5. I, therefore, directed Shri D. Narsingh to furnish a copy of the application to Shri D. Sengupta and further directed him to furnish copies of the 11 documents, which the management desired to be taken on record to Shri Sengupta within 7 days. Later the hearing was fixed for 27th May, 1958.

6. I may state that I also received an application from the learned Advocate representing the Sangh for issue of a witness summon upon the Sub-Inspector, Purulia Police Station, to prove some documents at the hearing on 27th May 1958. The witness summons was not, however, properly served and Shri D. Sengupta the learned Advocate for the Sangh did not press for the production of those documents.

7. At the hearing on 27th May 1958, Shri M. K. Mukherjee Advocate appeared along with Shri D. Narsingh for the management. Of the 11 documents which the Company wanted to bring on record, Shri D. Sengupta did not insist on formal proof of the documents bearing serial numbers 1, 2, 3 & 6 in the list of the 11 documents which had been filed along with the company's application and those were therefore taken on file and marked Exts. E5, E6, E7 and E8, and with regard to the remaining 7 documents, Shri Mukherjee stated that as the witness to prove the same was not present, he did not want to press their being taken on record.

8. I then heard the submissions of Shri Mukherjee and Shri Sengupta on the new exhibits filed. However, Shri Mukherjee the learned Advocate for the company wanted to raise certain legal contentions, which had not been raised in the written statement of the company nor had they been urged at the hearing of the dispute on 11th and 12th March, 1958. The hearing of the case was concluded but was re-opened in terms of the Company's application dated 14th March 1958 in which, as I have shown earlier, the company had only prayed that "a day be fixed for the hearing on this record before passing the Award" I, therefore, did not allow Mr. Mukherjee to address me on those new contentions which were being raised for the first time. The company by its application only wanted the hearing to be re-opened for the specific purposes of producing the documents which were in its possession and which it could not prove at the hearing on 11th and 12th March, and for an opportunity to make their submission thereon. I re-opened the enquiry—which I would ordinarily never have done for this specific purpose as the company pleaded that it should not be deprived of the chance of placing the documents which it had in its possession and which it pleaded it could not produce because it did not have sufficient opportunity to produce the same. In all other respects the hearing of the dispute was concluded. Virtually what Shri Mukherjee was attempting to do was to re-open the hearing, which was not at all what the company had prayed for in its application. The company at the hearing on 27th May 1958, did not take any steps to prove 7 of the documents and 4 of the documents of which Shri Sen Gupta did not insist, formal proof were taken on file and the submissions of both parties thereon were heard, which did not advance the Company's case any further.

9. I now proceed to deal with the dispute on its merits.

10. The Ranipur Colliery belongs to the Equitable Coal Company, which owns 8 collieries. Its managing agents are Messrs. Macneill & Barry Ltd., who are also the managing agents of all about 12 collieries. The Colliery employs about 1,900 workmen.

11. The events leading up to the present reference are briefly that Shri Ramdahin Singh, along with his brother Bileshwar Singh and the latter's son Jitendra Singh, were Contractors in the Colliery. According to the Sangh the workmen had a number of grievances against the contract system prevailing in the Colliery and against Shri Ramdahin Singh in particular. According to the Sangh Ramdahin Singh was not paying the workmen under him their proper dues and used to make illegal deductions from their wages and generally terrorise and oppress them by beating them up. He also indulged in anti Union activities, after the workmen of this colliery joined the Sangh and formed a local Branch in 1954. It is admitted that on 6th July 1956 there was a serious incident at the Colliery when Shri Harihar Choubey, the Organising Secretary of the Sangh's Branch in this colliery died of injuries inflicted upon him by bhallas and about 8 or 10 workers received serious injuries by gun-shots. The Union's case is that Shri Ramdahin Singh and his gang were responsible for this incident and that the gun-shots were fired by Shri Ramdahin Singh. Subsequently on 9th July 1956, at a mass meeting of the workers held after the funeral of Shri Harihar Choubey, the workmen passed a resolution demanding that the management should terminate the contract of Shri Ramdahin Singh and threatening to go on strike if he was not removed from Colliery. It is admitted that this resolution was forwarded to the management by the Sangh's letter of 10th July 1956 (Annexure B1 to the Sangh's written statement). The management by its notice dated 15th July 1956, terminated all the contracts of Shri Ramdahin Singh (See Exhibit E.1). The Union's case is that the contracts of Shri Ramdahin Singh were terminated by the management as a result of the demand made by the workmen while the company's contention is that the Union's letter reached it only on 16th July 1957, after it had on its own motion terminated the contracts of Shri Ramdahin Singh, because of the serious charges under Section 302/149, 307, 324 and 148 of the Indian Penal Code on which he along with others was being prosecuted by the police. On 15th February 1957, the Sessions Judge at Purulia acquitted Shri Ramdahin Singh of all the charges levelled against him, holding that none of the charges against him could be established beyond reasonable doubt by the prosecution, and that the firing by Ramdahin Singh was justified by the right of private defence. Only one accused in the case, namely Gaya Singh was found guilty and convicted under section 304 Part II of the Indian Penal Code, and was sentenced to undergo imprisonment for a period of 8 years. It was after his acquittal that the management employed Shri Ramdahin Singh as a Labour Supervisor in the Ranipur Colliery, on 3rd April 1957. No sooner the workmen learnt of this appointment there was considerable agitation among them and on 5th May 1957 the Sangh addressed a letter to the management expressing the workmen's resentment against the appointment of Shri Ramdahin Singh after they had succeeded in having his contract terminated in July of 1956 and demanded his removal from service. A reminder followed on 9th May 1957 and dispute was taken up in Conciliation, which resulted in failure and on 16th May 1957 the Sangh addressed another letter to the management demanding that unless Shri Ramdahin was removed from service, the workmen would go on strike from 20th May 1957 (See Annexure A series to the Sangh's written statement). The management did not relent and on 20th May 1957 the workmen went on strike which lasted till 7th June 1957, when a settlement was reached before the Conciliation Officer (Annexure 'B' to the Sangh's written statement), by which the management and the Sangh agreed to apply to Government under section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act to refer this dispute to this Tribunal for adjudication. This is an important document and therefore reproduce the 6 clauses of this settlement which are as follows:—

"(1) Both the parties agreed to request jointly the Government of India, in the Ministry of Labour under section 10(2) of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 to refer the following issue to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, for adjudication:—

"Is the appointment of Shri Ram dahin Singh as Supervisor at Ranipur colliery proper and are the Union's objection to his appointment and demand for his removal justified?"

(2) Both the parties will accept the award of the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, on the issue referred to it as final and binding on them and they will not prefer any appeal or writ petition or seek any other remedy from any Court in India.

- (3) While agreeing to items (1) and (2) above both the parties further agree not to raise at any stage of the proceedings before the Industrial Tribunal the question as to whether or not the issue referred to the Tribunal constitutes an Industrial dispute within the meaning of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 or any other Act for the time being in force.
- (4) The union undertakes to call off the strike at the colliery not later than Monday the 10th June 1957 and advise the workers to resume work forthwith.
- (5) The management will grant 15 days' time for the workers to resume work so as to enable those who might have left the colliery area to return to work.
- (6) There will be no victimisation of the workmen by the management.
- (7) The Union's demand for abolition of the contract system at this colliery will be discussed between the management and the union with a view to arriving at a mutual settlement after the strike is called off and normal work at the colliery is restored."

Thereafter the reference was made on 13th August 1957.

12. According to the union, of the 1900 workmen of the colliery 700 were treated as contractors' men, though they were direct employees of the company, entitled to all the benefits of provident fund, quarterly bonus, wages etc. from the company. The union alleges that Ramdahin Singh and the two other contractors used to make payments on behalf of the company and used to get a commission from the wages of their workmen. The Company admits that there were these three contractors in this colliery but its case is that Ramdahin Singh was a contractor for recruiting loaders and used to get a certain commission per tub of coal loaded by the 350 loaders recruited by him. According to the company these loaders were not the workmen of Shri Ramdahin Singh but were the direct employees of the management, who used to pay them their wages and other dues individually. The management has stated that Ramdahin Singh was also a surface contractor and as such had engaged about 50 trammers who were individually paid their wages by him, but under the supervision of an officer of the management as required by clause 4 of the standing orders. I shall presently deal with this topic in greater detail. The union also alleged that these three contractors belonged to the family of Shri Baccha Singh a well known money lender who used to lend money at exorbitant rates of interest and that his debtors were mostly workmen of this company, particularly those under the said contractors who used to recover the loans and interest thereon at their sweet will. Their allegation is that Ramdahin Singh also does money lending business and that the workers were under his debt and he used to terrorise them. The company in reply has not categorically denied the fact that Ramdahin Singh was doing money lending business and has stated in reply that the allegations on this point are neither admitted nor relevant to the issue. However, at the hearing of this dispute the union led evidence of Siddeswar Prasad Singh, Secretary of the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh (W.W. 2) who stated in his evidence on this point that he goes frequently to the colliery and knows that Ramdahin Singh had a bad reputation among the workers as he does money lending business among the workers and his behaviour is otherwise inhuman towards the workers. He was not cross-examined on this point. There is, therefore, some evidence on the record to suggest that Ramdahin Singh was also doing money lending business among the workers, which, as is well known is a common practice among labour contractors.

13. To proceed further, the union in its written statement has stated that the workmen had a number of grievances against the management. The main grievance being the contract system prevailing in the colliery and the system of payment to the individual workers through the contractors and all matters incidental thereto, and the workmen having failed to get redressed their grievances despite individual and collective representation, to the management, in about 1954 approached the Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh for forming the Branch union of this colliery and accordingly a branch union was formed somewhere in April 1954. According to the union this displeased the management and the contractors who opposed the union. On 9th November 1954 [Ex. W.2, Ex. W-2(A)] the union served a charter of demands on the company for the removal of their various grievances one of which was for individual payment of all the workers of the company as against collective payment which was being made through Ramdahin Singh and other contractors.

According to the union, in the meantime, the oppression of Shri Ramdahin Singh assumed serious proportions and in para 11 of its written statement the union alleges as follows:—

"That the oppression of Shri Ramdahin Singh during this period assumed serious proportion and besides his normal notoriety in cutting the workers' ears, illegally deducting the workers wages, physically assaulting the workers underground and others, he began terrorising the workers and started a serious anti-union campaign."

The union alleges that Shri Ramdahin Singh managed to discharge Md. Yusuf and Abdul Hamid, two prominent members of the union without assigning any reason and that on 5th June 1956 the Secretary of the union addressed a representation to the Conciliation Officer, Dhanbad, [Ex. W. 4 and W. 4(A)] and made specific complaint that false thumb impressions were shown in pay-sheets and thereby the workers were denied their earned wages and claimed that the individual workers should be paid directly and receipts be taken from individual workers. The union states that after the award of the All India Industrial Tribunal (Colliery Disputes), which came into force on 26th May 1956 (popularly known as Majumdar Award), the workmen started agitating for proper implementation of the Award and for payments to the individuals directly and the company and the contractors combined to disrupt the union with all vengeance.

14. The company on the other hand, has denied these allegations and it says that the trammers under Ramdahin Singh were paid wages individually by him under the supervision of an official of the company as stated above. The company has argued that the facts of such individual payments have been admitted by the concerned trammers themselves in their letter dated 7th August 1954 addressed by them to the Manager of the Ranipur Colliery which was forwarded to the company by Shri Kanti Mehta General Secretary of the Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh by his covering letter dated 19th August 1954. The company has annexed copies of these correspondence to its written statement as annexures A1 and A2. A2 is the letter dated 7th August 1954. In the opening sentence, the portion of the letter on which the management relies, the trammers stated:—

"With due respect we the trammers of Ranipur colliery beg to submit that you have kindly arranged for our individual payment in the office which was a difficulty from a long time."

I, however, find that in the letter the trammers went on to observe:

"But we regret to represent that the payment position is no better than what was done previously. We are only getting Rs. 11/- for a family man for six days work which should be Rs. 13/11/- for a family man for six days work."

"Over and above that, the payment is being done not from company's cash office staff but by contractor's man or by company's staff influenced by the contractors."

They, therefore, *inter alia* prayed that the payment should be done by the company's cash office staff. It does, therefore, appear that even though the company had arranged that the payment by Ramdahin Singh to the trammers should be made in the presence of the officer of the company, yet the workmen were alleging that such officers were controlled by or under the influence of the contractors. They, therefore, insisted that the payment should be made by the company's cash office staff. It is clear from this that the workmen had a grievance in the manner of the method of payment of their just dues by the contractor. The management denies that it was aware of any grievances of the workers against the contract system as such and it has stated that it is not relevant to the present dispute which relates to the employment of one employee of the management. I think the genesis of the whole trouble has been that the workmen dissatisfied and had a genuine grievance against the manner in which the contractors were exploiting them and the present demand for the removal of Ramdahin Singh relates back to his conduct when he was a contractor in the company. The company had denied that it disliked the Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh or its local branch. It says that it has recognised both the Sangh and the local Branch at Ranipur and its case is that its relation with the union are cordial. However, the Secretary of the Ranipur Branch of the Sangha (W.W.2) when questioned on the point in cross-examination, whilst admitting that the company recognised his union, has denied that the relations between the management and the Sangh were cordial.

15. With regard to the charter of demands dated 9th November 1954 the company admits that the same was forwarded by the Conciliation Officer to the management and it is said that there was no specific demand in that charter of demands against any of the three contractors, not to speak of Ramdahin Singh in particular.

16. The company, however, admits that there was a claim that all workers should be paid individually but it says that the demand did not specify whether the management's employees were alone indicated or all workers working in the colliery regardless of who their employers were. The demands submitted on 9th November 1954 are on record as Exhibit W-2 and the very first demand in that charter is as follows:—

*"Individual payment to all workers:*

Individual payment should be made to all workers including Trammers, Machinemen, Drillers etc. at the company's office Cashier in the company's Hazree sheets."

It is thus clear that the demand included individual payment for trammers including those who were under the contractors. It is also clear that even till 9th November 1954, the contractors' trammers had a grievance with regard to the manner in which payment was being made to them. In its written statement the management has not specifically denied the union's allegation as made in para 12 of its written statement that Shri Ramdahin Singh managed to discharge Mohd Yunus and Abdul Hamid the two prominent leaders of the union, without assigning any reason. The grievance with regard to the dismissal of these two workmen has been referred to in the letter dated 27th September 1954 [Ex. W-1(2)] addressed by Colliery Mazdoor Sangh to the Superintendent of Macneill & Barry Ltd. Their demand for reinstatement has also been referred to in item 6 of Ex. W-2(A) which is the charter of demands dated 9th November, 1954, earlier referred to and admitted by the management to have been received by it through the Conciliation Officer. The management has denied that it was aware of the alleged oppression of workers by Ramdahin Singh nor was it aware that Ramdahin Singh indulged in cutting the workers' ears, illegally deducting the workers' wages, physically assaulting the workers underground and others, and terrorising the workers and started a serious anti-union campaign. But that there was an incident of the cutting of the ears of a worker named Sahadev is clearly established from the documents on record. It has specifically been referred to in para 3 of the Union's letter to the Superintendent of Collieries dated 27th September 1954 [Ex. W-1(2).] In para 3 of the letter the Secretary of the Sangh complained that since the 18 trammers who were demanding individual payments were given work in three different shifts, they were being subjected to lot of harassment and trouble. As an instance, the case of Sahadev trammer whose ears were chopped off while on duty underground was referred to. In his letter, Shri Kanti Mehta, General Secretary of the Sangh, stated that Sahadev made complaints to the Manager as also to the Chief Welfare Officer and that he himself took this man to Shri Chowdhry in the absence of the Chief Welfare Officer and requested him to enquire into the case, and that he has also personally told the Superintendent about this and he complained that it was a matter of regret that no enquiry has been held nor the culprits brought to book. The cutting of Sahadev ear has also been referred to in the evidence of the union's secretary (W-W. 2), Shri S. P. Singh. With regard to this complaint the union has not been able to establish that Sahadev's ears had been cut by Ramdahin Singh or his workmen, though there is a strong suggestion to that effect. With regard to the other acts of terrorism of Ramdahin Singh, the union has relied upon the various letters addressed to the management. By the letter dated 5th July 1954 [Ex. W-1(1)] some 22 trammers made various allegations of threats of harassment and beating by Ramdahin Singh, Biteswar Singh and others. In his letter dated 27 September 1954 [Ex. W-1(2).] above referred to Shri Kanti Mehta had stated, "I am constrained to point out that the local management is bent upon harassing and victimising the workers who support our union. I think that a proper enquiry is called for if the relations between the management and the workers are not to deteriorate." Incidentally this letter also shows that the relation between the management and the union were far from cordial. Ex. W-1(5) is another letter dated 7th February 1956 in which it is alleged that on 2nd February 1956 two of the workers namely Jagdeo Singh and Kalamdin loaders, members of the Bihar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh, Branch Ranipur colliery, had been badly beaten by Shri Ram Narain Singh and other men of the contractors because they are members of the Colliery Mazdoor Sangh. In Ex. W-1(6), which is another letter

dated 21st February 1956 addressed by the Secretary of the Sangh to the Superintendent of the collieries Messrs. Macneill & Barry Ltd. the beating up of Jagdeo Singh and Kalamdin at the quarter of Ramdahin Singh is also referred to. In that letter they have stated that there was a refusal of the doctor to put them on sick report. In that letter in item 11 it was stated that though the payment to contractor's men from the company's office under supervision of the company's officers was agreed to, it had not been implemented so far. There are also complaints against the contractors men in the letter dated 2nd June 1956, Ex. W-1(7) addressed by the Secretary to the Superintendent of the colliery. I may state that copies of these letters were produced from the file of the union and have been proved by the evidence of Shri Sudhendu Das Gupta, the Secretary of the colliery Mazdoor Sangh (W.W. 1). Shri D. Narsingh, when questioned by me said that he neither admitted nor denied these letters. It appears to me on the evidence of the witnesses and the non-committal submission on behalf of the management that these letters were addressed to and received by the company. From all these records and the evidence of the Secretaries of the Sangh (W.W. 2 and W.W. 3) it does appear that there were acts of oppression and violence by Ramdahin Singh against the workers and that the union had made complaints about this even prior to the incident of 6th July 1956, to which I shall presently refer, I am also satisfied that since the union was agitating these complaints with regard to these acts of oppression and violence on the part of Ramdahin Singh and his men against the workers, Ramdahin Singh had adopted an anti-union attitude. In this connection, I accept the evidence of Shri Sideswar Prasad Singh (W.W. 2) the Secretary of the Ranipur Branch when he stated that in May 1954 when as Organising Secretary, he had organised the Branch of the Sangh at this colliery, he was assaulted by the workmen of Shri Ramdahin Singh, who at his instigation had tried to throw him in the pit of the colliery.

17. The next important event is the incident on 6th July 1956 which took place at the colliery and which resulted in the death of Shri Harihar Choubey, the then Organising Secretary of the local branch of the Sangh and injury by gun shot wounds to 8 to 10 other workmen. The union has referred to the incident in paras 15 and 16 of its written statement which are as follows:—

"that on July, 6, 1956 while Banslochan Singh, Vice-President and Shri Harihar Choubey, Organising Secretary of the local union and others were returning from pit-mouth Shri Ramdahin Singh and his hired goondas attacked them with deadly weapons like guns and bhalas quite unprovoked and without any notice and Shri Harihar Choubey died and some eight or ten persons were seriously injured with gun shot injuries on their persons from a close range.

That there was a Police case in the matter and it was proved beyond doubt that shots were fired from the gun of Shri Ramdahin Singh."

18. The management's version of what happened on that date is stated as follows in para 12 of its written statement:

"12. That the allegations contained in para 15 of the workmen's statement are maliciously false. It is not a fact that Shri Harihar Choubey had died of gunshot injuries, nor that the firing resorted to by Shri Ramdahin Singh on the particular occasion was unprovoked. In fact, no person had died on account of firing done by Shri Ramdahin Singh. The case was tried by the learned Sessions Judge of Purulia, who by his judgment dated 15th February 1957 acquitted Sri Ramdahin Singh of all the charges made against him as admitted in para 18 of the workmen's statement, the learned judge categorically finding that the firing done by Sri Ramdahin Singh was in private defence and that it was, therefore, justified as it was "resorted to by him as a last measure only against a danger present and imminent." The learned Sessions Judge had also further found that the situation was so tense and fraught with such danger that "but for this gunfiring, the situation might have ended in more tragic consequences." The said finding of the learned Judge was based, *inter alia* on the dying declaration of the said Sri Hari Har Choubey himself, Organising Secretary of the Union who had died on account of injuries inflicted upon him by someone other than Shri Ramdahin Singh. In these circumstances, the allegation made in para 16 of the workmen's statement is, therefore, irrelevant."

19. From this order of acquittal of Shri Ramdahin Singh dated 12th May 1957, at the instance of the workers a Criminal Revision Petition No. 466 of 1957 under Section 438 Cr. P.C. had been filed and admitted by the High Court of Calcutta

as is established by the evidence of Shri Tripathi (W.W. 3). The matter is thus sub-judice and I therefore refrain from commenting on the allegations made by the workmen on the part played by Shri Ramdahin Singh in that incident. The judgment of the Sessions Judge, Purulia, however, has been filed by the management (Ex. E-3). From the judgment it appears that Ramdahin Singh was charged with offences under Section 302/149 307, 324 and 148 of I.P.C. The Sessions Judge acquitted him of all the charges and held that Ramdahin Singh committed no offence by firing 3 or 4 gun shots and observed that at any rate he should be given the benefit of doubt and be acquitted of the charges under Sections 324 and 307 I.P.C.

20. This brings me to the termination of the contracts of Shri Ramdahin Singh by the management's notice dated 15th July 1954 (Ex. E-1). The company's case is that it on its own motion terminated the contracts of Shri Ramdahin Singh because he was charged with these serious offences under the I.P.C. arising out of the incident on 6th July 1956 and that such termination had taken place even before it received the union's letter dated 10th July 1956 in which the Sangh had demanded the immediate removal of Shri Ramdahin Singh from this colliery. According to the management that letter was received by it on 16th July 1956. Now, the workmen's story is that on 9th July 1956 there was a mass meeting attended by 10,000 people at Ranipur colliery where the following resolution was unanimously passed:—

"This meeting of the workers of Ranipur colliery by passing a resolution to take their decision unanimously to go on strike if the management would not decide to remove the contractor Shri Ramdahin Singh within 14 days from date."

21. It is admitted that this resolution was forwarded by the Secretary of the Bilhar Colliery Mazdoor Sangh to the Manager, Ranipur colliery at Dishergarh by his letter dated 10th July 1956 and the workers say that it is because of this demand that the management terminated the contracts of Shri Ramdahin Singh. The management, on the other hand, states that this letter of 10th July 1956 was received by it only on 16th July 1956 and that prior to the receipt of this letter it had on its own motion by its said notice dated 15th July 1956 terminated all the contracts of Shri Ramdahin Singh with effect from 22nd July 1956. Thus the company's stand is that the termination of Ramdahin's contract was not effected because the workers had demanded his removal, but by the company of its own volition because he was charged by the Police with serious offences under the Indian Penal Code. Even assuming that the union's letter dated 10th July 1956 only reached the management on 16th July 1956, it would be difficult to hold that the management was not aware of the resolution passed at the mass meeting of workers held on 9th July 1956. The meeting was held near the Ranipur colliery and it is impossible to believe that the management was not aware that at that meeting a resolution had been passed demanding the removal of Shri Ramdahin Singh. In fact the Secretary of the Union (W.W. 3) in his evidence at the hearing stated that at the time of the funeral of Harihar Choubey on 9th July 1956, 10,000 workers had attended the meeting at which the resolution demanding the removal of Ramdahin Singh from the colliery was passed. He was not even cross-examined on this point. In the union's letter of 5th April 1957 (Annexure A series to the Union's written statement) the union had specifically stated:—

"You are aware as to how bitter are the feelings of the workers about this gentleman. They left no stone unturned to have the contract of Shri Singh terminated..... There was a revolt against this man and you were kind enough to take the sentiment of the workers into consideration and terminate his contract."

There is no reply from the management to this on record denying this statement. I am satisfied that the management was well aware by 15th July, 1956 that the workers had demanded the removal of Ramdahin Singh and that it terminated its contract because the workers had demanded his removal. This is also supported by the fact that in the notice which the management had served on Ramdahin Singh it had no where stated that his contracts were being terminated because he was involved in the criminal prosecution launched against him, arising out of the incident that took place on 6th July, 1956. If it was so, the management would have so stated it. The notice of termination of contract is categorical and states no reasons. I, therefore, hold without hesitation that the termination of the contract of Ramdahin Singh on 15th July, 1956 was made by the management because the workers had demanded his removal from the Ranipur Colliery.

22. This brings us to the date of Shri Ramdahin's appointment as the Labour Supervisor of the colliery. No sooner the union came to know of this it addressed a letter on 5th April, 1957 to the Superintendent of the colliery expressing its painful surprise over this appointment. It stated that since the workers had

come to know of it there was a commotion and a large scale agitation which could only be calmed on the manager's assurance that the matter would be discussed the next day. In the letter the Secretary of the Sangh States as follows:—

"You are aware as to how bitter are the feelings of the workers about this gentleman. They left no stone unturned to have the contract of Shri Singh terminated. Agitations and demonstrations were frequently staged. On the other hand, the contractor also tried to create mischief and trouble. Ultimately he opened fire on the unarmed workers as a result of which a prominent officer of our union was killed and several others were injured. There was a revolt against this man and you were kind enough to take the sentiment of the workers into consideration and terminate his contract. While the union and the workers had been trying to have the contract of his relative Shri Biteswar Singh and other terminated, and thus remove the source of discontent and dissatisfaction for the colliery for good, the appointment of Shri Ramdahin Singh has come like a bolt from the blue."

"We sincerely feel that the appointment of Shri Ramdahin Singh has been the most unjust and injudicious step that the company could even have taken in defiance of the sentiments of the workers. It appears that this has been done only with the view of suppressing the union and the legitimate rights of the workers and also to provoke them to some action which ordinarily they are not inclined to do."

The letter ended by requesting the Superintendent of Collieries to cancel the appointment of Shri Ramdahin Singh as Labour Supervisor and to remove him from the Ranipur Colliery, failing which the workers would have no option except to resort to direct action including a strike. In the letter it also demanded the termination of the contract of Biteswar Singh and Shri Jitender Singh without any further delay. Then the correspondence already referred to earlier followed and after failure of conciliation on 20th May, 1957 the workers of this colliery went on a general strike which lasted till 7th June 1957, when the settlement was reached before the Conciliation Officer and a joint application by the parties to the Government to refer this dispute for adjudication.

23. The union has argued that the appointment of Shri Ramdahin Singh as Labour Supervisor in the colliery was not conducive to industrial peace as the appointment was bound to strain the relations of the employers and employees and between the workmen and Ramdahin Singh in particular. It has argued that no individual is indispensable for an industry far less a man of Shri Ramdahin Singh's doubtful reputation. It is urged that the appointment was *malafide* and it had reasonably provoked the workmen and has caused grave unrest and was bound to have serious repercussions of grave consequences. It is stated that having in mind the past conduct of Ramdahin Singh as contractor and the part played by him in the incident on 6th July 1956, the workers could not tolerate his fresh appointment after he was removed. It is, therefore, prayed that the appointment of Ramdahin Singh should be held to be *malafide* and improper and unjust and he be directed to be removed and such order may be passed as the Tribunal may deem fit in the circumstances of the case.

24. The management on the other hand has argued that it has the inherent right to appoint its employees as part of the management's function and that the present demand of the union militates against that right of the management and is also otherwise unjustified. It denies that the management had acted *malafide* or in an imprudent manner. It has urged that it had no reason to question the character of Ramdahin Singh as suggested by the union. It has also pleaded that the appointment was made in a *bonafide* manner and in the course of the proper discharge of its functions and that the workman have no right to challenge the same. It has characterised the demand of the workmen as an instance of un-called for vindictiveness and victimisation. It has also pleaded that Ramdahin Singh's father was a pensioner of the company having retired after 47 years' meritorious service with this company. In view of this fact and in view of Shri Ramdahin Singh's established innocence by his acquittal by the Sessions Judge, Purulia, and also in view of his loyal and faithful service rendered by him for over 10 years, the management was justified in appointing him as Labour Supervisor. The management further pleads that Ramdahin's functions are entirely supervisory and he has to assist the management to maintain the output with due regard to safety, economy and efficiency. That he has now nothing to do with the payment of wages. That the management sees no reason to keep him out of employment without renewing his contract, which it could have done



with justification, and that since the appointment he has rendered efficient and useful service and their has been no incident thereafter even remotely justifying his removal from service.

25. There can be no doubt from the facts stated above that there was a justifiable feeling of resentment among the workers against Ramdahin Singh, even prior to the incident of 6th July 1956, and that after the incident of 6th July 1956 the workmen had with one voice demanded his removal from the Ranipur colliery. As already held by me, it was in compliance with this demand that Ramdahin Singh's contracts were terminated by the company's notice dated 15th July 1956.

26. The management, on the other hand, has argued that as Shri Ramdahin Singh was acquitted, there was no reason why he should not be taken back in the colliery. Formerly Shri Ramdahin Singh was a contractor and now he has been taken back as a direct employee of the company and that too as Labour Supervisor. No doubt, the management has a right to select its personnel and we have not yet in our country reached the stage of closed union shops as in the countries of the west. Ordinarily an Industrial Tribunal would not interfere with the exercise of the right of the management to select its own personnel. But the management in exercising the right must act in a bonafide, prudent and reasonable manner. I am afraid in this case the company has not acted in a prudent or reasonable manner and I am not satisfied that it acted in a bona fide manner as contended by it, in appointing Shri Ramdahin Singh as a direct employee and that too to the post of Labour Supervisor, where he has directly to deal with workmen employed in the colliery, the large body of whom undoubtedly, strongly resent his presence there. Any prudent and reasonable employer would have realised, from the facts and circumstances narrated above, that the workmen would strongly resent the employment of Shri Ramdahin after they had succeeded in making the management terminate his contracts in July 1956. I cannot help feeling that in appointing Shri Ramdahin Labour Supervisor the management unnecessarily provoked the dying embers of the strong resentment which the workmen entertained against Shri Ramdahin Singh of which, the management was well aware. Any prudent employer would have realised that such appointment would lead to industrial un-rest as in fact it did, when the workmen in a body struck work from 20th May 1957 to 7th June 1957, in protest against the management's refusal to terminate his appointment. The management has sought to justify his appointment on the ground of the long and faithful services that Shri Ramdahin Singh's father had rendered to this company and on the ground of the 10 years' work which Ramdahin himself had done in the colliery as a contractor. I am, however, not impressed by this contention. There were surely many other ways open to the management of compensating Shri Ramdahin Singh for his or his father's services to the company. As is admitted, there are in all 12 collieries under the managing agency of Messrs. Macneill & Barry Limited. Surely, if the company's sole intention was to reward Shri Ramdahin for his past loyal service, the management could, very well have fulfilled this good intention by giving him some other appointment in one of the 11 other collieries under its management.

27. I am inclined to the view that the management was well aware of the strong feelings of resentment of the workmen against Shri Ramdahin and still appointed him in the face of that feeling. In justification the management has pleaded a number of reasons which I shall deal presently. Shri Omprakash Bhatnagar the Labour Relations Officer of the colliery (E.W.1) in his evidence has stated that as Labour Supervisor, Shri Ramdahin's duties are to see that the workers attend regularly and to look after their efficient working and their safety. But it was admitted by him that Ramdahin held no special qualification for safety measures nor did he hold any certificate under the Mines Act for that kind of work. He further stated that the reports of the work of Ramdahin were satisfactory and that the manager was also satisfied with his work. In cross-examination it was ascertained that prior to Ramdahin's appointment there was no such post of Labour Supervisor in the Ranipur Colliery or in any of the other 12 collieries of which Messrs. Macneill & Barry Limited, are the managing agents, including the six collieries owned by Equitable Coal Co. Ltd., where there were posts of Surface Supervisors. It does, therefore, appear that a new post was created for appointing Ramdahin Singh as Labour Supervisor, although he has no qualification for attending to measures for the safety of the workers which is one of the duties he is expected to perform.

28. It is next pleaded by the management that since the appointment of Shri Ramdahin the monthly raising in this colliery has gone up and a statement (Ex. E-4) of the monthly raising of coal in this colliery for 1957 and 1958 has been filed. It does appear that the raisings have gone up, but this cannot all be ascribed to the

efforts of Shri Ramdahn Singh. It is well known that during the last year the average raising of coal has shown considerable improvement in the coal industry as a whole and many are inclined to the view that this is in a measure due to the higher wages that have been prescribed for the colliery workers by the Majumdar Award and the Labour Appellate Tribunal. It would be strange indeed if the efforts of a single labour supervisor could send up the average monthly raisings in a big colliery like this, so substantially as has happened in this colliery.

29. After considering the submissions of the parties, I am satisfied that the appointment of Shri Ramdahn Singh as Labour Supervisor was not proper.

30. The next question is whether the demand of the workmen for his removal is justified. I am quite conscious that we have not reached the stage of closed union shops in this country. As far as I am aware, so far there has been no case where the demand of the workmen for the removal from service of another employee has been referred to adjudication. I am also conscious of my responsibilities in this reference as I am virtually appointed as an Arbitrator under the terms of settlement between the parties. I have given the matter my most anxious and earnest consideration. The exercise of the right of an employer to employ a workman of its own choice should not lightly be interfered with by a Tribunal. But in this case the management, at an earlier stage on the demand of the workmen, had terminated the contracts of Ramdahn Singh and his re-appointment in my opinion was in the circumstances of the case improper, unjustified and lacking in bona fides. That the workmen had resented the appointment very strongly, is proved by the fact that they resorted to a strike from 20th May, 1957 to 5th April, 1957 against the appointment of Shri Ramdahn Singh and upon the management's refusal to remove him. As I have held there was reasonable and justifiable grounds for this resentment dating back to the period when Shri Ramdahn Singh was the contractor.

31. I therefore hold the appointment of Ramdahn Singh was not proper and that the union's demand for his removal from service is justified.

32. The next question that arises is whether any consequential directions should be given. The union in its written statement has prayed for an order directing the removal of Shri Ramdahn Singh from service. The company in its written statement has however stated that such an order is beyond the scope of the present agreed reference. The reference is under Section 10(2). On a reasonable construction of the agreement reached between the parties, which is the basis of their joint application to Government for reference under Section 10(2), the only inference to draw is that both the parties agreed to abide by the directions which the Tribunal would give its findings on the issues referred to it. This is the underlying spirit of the settlement reached between the parties when they agreed to refer this dispute for adjudication. A tribunal when making an award is entitled and has powers to give consequential directions on the findings which it may have reached, otherwise there would be no finality to any adjudication proceedings. Section 10(4) of the Act provides that the Tribunal shall confine its adjudication to the points of reference and *matters incidental thereto*. A point is incidental to another point when the former necessarily depends upon the other (See Wharton's Law Dictionary and 1954-I-L.L.J. p. 317). The directions which I am proposing to make are in the spirit of the agreement reached between the parties, incidental to the findings I have given and are necessary consequential directions to give in order that the award may achieve the objective of finality.

33. Considering all the circumstances of the case, I would direct the management to transfer Shri Ramdahn Singh from Ranipur colliery to some other colliery under its management. As I have pointed out earlier there are five other collieries of Messrs Equitable Coal Co. Ltd., and several other collieries under the managing agency of Messrs. Macneill & Barry Limited and it would not be at all difficult for the management to transfer Shri Ramdahn Singh from Ranipur colliery to another colliery under its management and I direct that it should do so within a month from the date this award becomes enforceable.

34. Since the workmen has succeeded in this adjudication, I think it is a fit case in which I should award costs against the company and I therefore direct the management to pay Rs. 200 as costs to the colliery Mazdoor Sangh.

(Sd.) SALIM M. MERCHANT,  
Chairman.

**S.O. 1312.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by section 7-A of the Industrial Disputes Act 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby constitutes an Industrial Tribunal with headquarters at Bangalore and appoints Shri A. Das Gupta as the Presiding Officer of that Tribunal.

[No. LR II/57(1)/56.]

#### ORDER

*New Delhi, the 24th June 1958*

**S.O. 1313.**—Whereas, the Central Government is of the opinion that an industrial dispute exists between the employers in relation to the Kankanee Colliery, P.O. Bansjora, D.stt. Dhanbad, and their workmen in respect of the matters specified in the Schedule hereto annexed;

And whereas the Central Government considers it desirable to refer the said dispute for adjudication;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by clause (d) of sub-section (1) of section 10 of the Industrial Disputes Act, 1947 (14 of 1947), the Central Government hereby refers the said dispute for adjudication to the Industrial Tribunal, Dhanbad, constituted under section 7A of the said Act.

#### SCHEDULE

Whether the superannuation of Shri H. C. Chakravarty, Personnel Officer, Kankanee Colliery, is justified or not? In either case, what relief he is entitled to and from whom i.e. the present or the old management.

[No. LR II-2(10)/58.]

A. L. HANDA, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 27th June 1958*

**S.O. 1314.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-section (1) of Section 6 of the Mines Act, 1952 (35 of 1952), the Central Government hereby appoints Shri P. N. Sinha, an officer of the Mines Department, to be an Inspector of Mines subordinate to the Chief Inspector.

[No. M-I-8(58)/58.]

*New Delhi, the 1st July 1958*

**S.O. 1315.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by sub-regulation (1) of regulation 11 of the Coal Mines Regulations, 1957, the Central Government hereby appoints Shri D. R. Bagroy, Chief Mining Engineer of the National Coal Development Corporation, Ranchi, as a member of the Board of Mining Examinations constituted under the said sub-regulation for a term of three years *vice* Shri B. H. Engineer.

[No. MI-43(16)/57.]

B. R. KHANNA, Under Secy.

*New Delhi, the 30th June 1958*

**S.O. 1316.**—Whereas by resolution No. WB-7(2), dated the 26th December 1957 of the Government of India in the Ministry of Labour and Employment, a Central Wage Board for the Sugar Industry has been set up to inquire into a definite matter of public importance, namely, to work out a wage structure based on the principles of fair wages as set forth in the Report of the Committee on Fair Wages and the principles that should govern the grant of bonus to workers in the sugar industry;

And whereas the Central Government is of the opinion that, having regard to the nature of the inquiry to be made and other circumstances of the case, all the provisions of the Commissions of Inquiry Act, 1952 (60 of 1952) should be made applicable to the Central Wage Board for the Sugar Industry;

Now, therefore, in exercise of the powers conferred by section 11 and sub-section (1) of section 5 of the said Act, the Central Government hereby directs that all the provisions of the said Act, including those contained in sections 4 and 5, shall apply to the Central Wage Board aforesaid.

[No. WB-7(37).]

K. N. NAMBIAR, Dy. Secy.

**MINISTRY OF INFORMATION AND BROADCASTING***New Delhi, the 30th June 1958*

**S.O. 1317.**—In exercise of the powers conferred by the proviso to article 309 of the Constitution, the President hereby makes the following rules regulating the method of recruitment to the post of Inspector of Accounts in the Directorate General, All India Radio, namely:—

*Short Title.*—These rules will be called Directorate General, All India Radio, New Delhi Recruitment Rules, 1958.

*Method of Recruitment.*—Recruitment to the post of Inspector of Accounts in the Directorate General, All India Radio, New Delhi shall be made in accordance with the provisions contained in the schedule.

[No. 11(5)56-B(A).]

S. L. BHALLA, Under Secy.

**ORDERS***New Delhi, the 25th June 1958*

**S.O. 1318.**—The Central Government hereby:

(a) directs, in pursuance of the provisions of the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.R.O. 3805, dated the 26th December, 1955 and in modification of the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 866, dated the 8th May, 1958 that the Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Censors at Madras shall consist of 18 members with effect from 17th March, 1958, 17 members with effect from 24th March, 1958, 16 members with effect from 28th April, 1958, 23 members with effect from 8th May, 1958 and 22 members with effect from 12th June, 1958; and

(b) notifies for general information that the following members of the Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Censors at Madras retired under sub-rule (1) of rule 10 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1951 with effect from the dates indicated against their names:

1. Shrimati Shanti Humayun Kabir—17th March 1958.
4. Shrimati Satyawati Malik—28th April 1958
3. Shri M. N. Kapur—12th June 1958.

[No. 11/1/58-FC.]

**S.O. 1319.**—The Central Government hereby:

(a) directs, in pursuance of the provisions of the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.R.O. 3805, dated the 26th December, 1955 and in modification of the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 719, dated the 26th April, 1958 that the Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Censors at Calcutta shall consist of 17 members with effect from 6th October, 1957, 16 members with effect from 14th January, 1958, 12 members with effect from 1st March, 1958, 11 members with effect from 5th March, 1958, and 14 members with effect from 15th March, 1958; and

(b) notifies for general information that the following members of the Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Censors at Calcutta retired under sub-rule (1) of rule 10 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1951 with effect from the dates indicated against their names:

1. Dr. Pratul Chandra Gupta—6th October, 1957.
2. Dr. R. C. Mazumdar—1st March 1958.
3. Prof. Priyaranjan Sen—1st March 1958.
4. Shrimati Dr. Seeta Parmanand—1st March 1958.

5. Shri Tajamul Hussain—1st March 1958.

6. Shrimati Ayesha Ahmed—5th March 1958.

(c) supersedes Government of India, Ministry of Information and Broadcasting Notification No. S.O. 718, dated the 26th April, 1958.

[No. 11/1/58-FC.]

S.O. 1320.—The Central Government hereby:

(a) directs, in pursuance of the provisions of the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.R.O. 3805, dated the 26th December, 1955 and in modification of the Order of the Government of India in the Ministry of Information and Broadcasting No. S.O. 1065, dated the 3rd June, 1958 that the Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Censors at Bombay shall consist of 29 members with effect from 11th February, 1958, 22 members with effect from 1st March, 1958, 21 members with effect from 4th March, 1958, 24 members with effect from 15th March, 1958, 26 members with effect from 12th April, 1958, 23 members with effect from 14th April, 1958, and 25 members with effect from 3rd June, 1958; and

(b) notifies for general information that the following members of the Advisory Panel of the Central Board of Film Censors at Bombay retired under sub-rule (1) of rule 10 of the Cinematograph (Censorship) Rules, 1951 with effect from the dates indicated against their names:

1. Shri M. M. Begg—11th February 1958.
2. Shrimati B. Tarabai—11th February 1958.
3. Shri A. N. Basu—1st March 1958.
4. Shri Radha Raman—1st March 1958
5. Shri Krishna Kripalani—1st March 1958.
6. Shrimati Gopa Bhardwaj—4th March 1958.
7. Shrimati Chandravati Lakhanpal—14th April 1958.
8. Shrimati Sharda Bhargava—14th April 1958.
9. Shrimati Lilavati Munshi—14th April 1958

[No. 11/1/58-FC.]

D. R. KHANNA, Under Secy.

